REMARKS and ARGUMENTS

This response is to the Office communication mailed in the above-referenced case on Jan. 24, 2008.

1.0 Applicant assumes Examiner meant amendments filed on 12/13/2007.

4.0 Examiner rejects claims 19, 22-24, 27-28, and 34-36 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. 7,213,061 to Hite in view of U.S. 6,362,783 to Suguria.

4.1 Applicant respectfully points out that U.S. 6,362,783 to Suguria, et al. has absolutely no relevance to the instant invention or to the invention of Hite. Suguria is disclosing a method to locate a mobile radio transmitter. Please note the Abstract of U.S. 6,362,783:

*"A method of detecting **a position of a radio mobile station in radio communications**, which is capable of accurately and simply finding the position of the mobile station. At a measuring point the mobile station measures the reception radio strength levels from a plurality of base stations and conveys the measurement results through the base station to a control station. The control station learns, through a neural network, the correlation between the reception radio strength levels and the position of the mobile station on the basis of the measurement results at a plurality of measuring points and the positions of the measuring points. Subsequently, when the mobile station communicates to the control station the reception radio strength levels measured at an arbitrary point, the control station estimates the position of the mobile station, causing those measurement results, on the basis of the correlation obtained through the learning."*

The words "internet" and "sensor" do not appear in the Suguria specification or claims.

4.2 There is clearly no motivation to combine Hite and Suguria because the inventions are unrelated and have no common purpose or components. The instant invention, as well as

Hite, makes no use of "mobile radios" or neural networks or "measuring points".

4.3 With all due respect, Examiners comments in the last sentence of her 4.a. do not apply to the instant invention; the instant invention has no "mobile station". The RF transmitter of the instant invention is of limited range and signal strength, in no way comparable to the radio transmitters of Suguria's invention. There is no market pressure or design need or incentive to combine the Hite and Suguria inventions; the instant invention is already superior and lower cost for its applications. Suguria teaches no elements, including "base station" which are a simple substitution into the instant invention's components; Suguria has no relevance to the instant invention or to Hite.

4.4 Examiner cites that Suguria teaches a "base station" comprising a "wireline". Please note in §14 L15:

*"…and **a base station** 105 is made up of a base station control section 106 for controlling the operation of the base station 106, a base station transmission and reception section 107 for signal transmission and reception to and from the mobile station 101, and a base station input and output section 108 for signal transmission and reception to and from a control station 111 through **a wire line**, and further the control station 111 is equipped with a control station control section 112 for controlling the operation of the control station 111, a communication control section 113 for controlling the communication with the base station 105, a position input section 114 for undergoing the input of coordinate data on a radio strength measuring point, position learning processing section 115 for learning, through a neural network, the correlation between the position of the mobile station 101 and the reception radio strength level at that point and for storing the correlation there between, and a position estimation processing section 116 for estimating the position of the mobile*

station 101 on the basis of the measured radio strength level through the use of the stored correlation. In FIG. 1, numerals 109 and 110 represent different base stations each having the same arrangement as that of the base station 105."

The fact that Suguria uses the terms "base station" and "wire" is not cause for relevance to the instant invention. The "control unit" of the instant invention is wired to sensors and actuators and is in RF communication with a "base station" which has internet access. The base station of the instant invention, as stated in the claims, has an internet connection and is located "at the user's premise" and "in communication with sensing and actuating subsystems". The base stations and wire lines of Suguria have none of the attributes or features of the instant invention as detailed in the claims or specification. Suguria's "wire line" and the "wiring interface" of the instant invention are not interchangeable and do not provide the same functionality in the respective inventions other an electrical connection.

4.5 Claims 19, 24, 29 and 34 contain the restriction, substantially:

"… a base station with Internet connection at the user's premise, the base station in communication with sensing subsystems and actuating subsystems at individual ones of the home-automated systems and appliances; wherein all communication to the sensing subsystems and actuating subsystems is done through a control unit comprising a wiring interface portion, and an input-output section coupled to a microcontroller; …".

These elements are not found in the prior art; the elements are not in the prior art of Hite or Suguria or Gelvin; the elements are not suggested by the prior art; the elements of the instant invention cannot be formed by any combination of elements of the cited prior art.

6.0 Examiner rejects claims 29-33 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. 7,213,061 to Hite in view of U.S. 6,826,607 to Gelvin. Applicant respectfully points out that

Examiner failed to respond to Applicant's arguments as presented in the Office Action Response of Dec. 13, 2007; in P2 Examiner says Applicant's arguments are moot in view of new grounds of rejection.

6.1 Applicant respectfully points out that neither Hite nor Gelvin teach a system comprising a base station and a control unit wherein:

"…all communication to the sensing subsystems and actuating subsystems is done through a control unit comprising a wiring interface portion, and an input-output section coupled to a microcontroller; …".

As Examiner Bayard pointed out in a telephone conversation of Nov. 27, Gelvin does allow for a "wired" connection between a sensor node and an internet gateway; however Gelvin does not teach or suggest a control unit, not internet enabled, through which all communication with a sensor node travels. Gelvin teaches and requires a sensor node to be internet enabled.

6.2 In the instant invention sensors and actuators are accessible only through a control unit, a condition clearly structurally different from Gelvin and Hite and stated in the claims of the instant invention.

6.3 Applicant respectfully points out that the instant invention does not rely on a "low power distributed sensor network" since the sensors are hard wired to a control unit. Additionally, a "10 Mbps Ethernet network" is not mentioned in the specification or claims of the instant invention. Examiner's remarks with regard to combining Hite and Gelvin for an interface between the two do not make much sense.

6.4 Applicant respectfully points out that the prior art references as relied upon by the Examiner as a §103 rejection do not contain, singly or in combination, every element recited

in the claims in as complete detail as is contained in the claims and arranged as recited in the claims.

Conclusion:

Applicant has shown that the cited prior art does not teach or suggest the instant invention.

Applicant respectfully requests that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case.

Respectfully submitted,

__/Dennis S. Fernandez/_____
Dennis S. Fernandez, ESQ.
Reg. No. 34,160

Date:__4/14/2008_____

Address: **FERNANDEZ & ASSOCIATES, LLP**
Patent Attorneys

Customer No: **22877**

Phone: (650) 325-4999
Fax: (650) 325-1203
Email: *iploft@iploft.com*